

| - 1 | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 1 | Kimberly E. Colwell, Esq. (SBN: 127604) Jennifer C. Addams, Esq. (SBN: 209355) MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON 555 12th Street, Suite 1500 | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 4 | Oakland, CA 94607 Telephone: (510) 808-2000 | | |
| | Facsimile: (510) 444-1108 | | |
| 5 | Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF FAIRFIELD, | | |
| 6 | CHIEF OF POLICE WILLIAM GRESHAM, | | |
| 7 | POLICE OFFICERS MARK SCHRAER, CHAD TIGERT and STEVE TROJANOWSKI, J | R | |
| 8 | on in the state and state and state, the | ••• | |
| 9 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 10 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | MARQUES PHILLIPS and CYNTHIA M. PHILLIPS, |) CASE NO: CIV-S-04-0377 FCD PAN | |
| 13 | Plaintiffs, |) DEFEND ANTEG OPPOSITION TO | |
| 14 | | DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STAY | |
| 15 | VS. | PROCEEDINGS | |
| 16 | CITY OF FAIRFIELD, CHIEF OF POLICE WILLIAM GRESHAM and Does 1 through 10, |)) DATE: April 15, 2005 | |
| 17 | MARK SCHRAER, CHAD TIGERT AND STEVE TROJANOWSKI, JR. and Does 11 |) TIME: 10:00 a.m.) DEPT: 2 | |
| 18 | through 20, | JUDGE: Honorable Frank C. Damrell, Jr. | |
| 19 | Defendants. | Trial Date: September 13, 2005 | |
| 20 | |) | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| _5 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Defs' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Proceedings [S-04-0377 FCD PAN]

Case 2:04-cv-00377-FCD-EFB Document 20 Filed 04/05/05 Page 2 of 3

The City of Fairfield, Police Chief William Gresham, Police Officers Mark Schraer, Chad Tigert and Steve Trojanowski hereby objects to Plaintiffs' Request to Stay Proceedings Until Plaintiffs Find New Counsel. Defendants do not object to Plaintiffs' attorney's Motion to Withdraw as Counsel, however, granting a stay, especially an indefinite one, at this point in the litigation would be prejudicial to Defendants.

Plaintiffs filed this action against Defendants on March 5, 2004. The complaint was made up of three causes of action alleging civil rights violations and nine state law claims. On January 6, 2005 Plaintiffs stated that they needed more time due to unstated difficulties with their case. All parties stipulated to extend discovery, motion hearing cut-off and trial dates. The parties agreed that discovery would cut off on March 21, 2005, dispositive motions would be heard on May 13, 2005, the pretrial conference would be July 8, 2005, and trial would be August 1, 2005. (See Stipulation attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Jennifer C. Addams.) On January 14, 2005 the order confirming these dates was signed by Judge Frank C. Damrell. (See Order attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of Jennifer C. Addams.) Discovery was cut off on March 21, 2005 with the exception of Plaintiff Marques Phillips' Independent Medical Examination which he has agreed to reschedule after missing his first scheduled one.

Plaintiffs participated equally in this stipulation and have had these dates for over three months. Defendants acknowledge that Plaintiffs apparently have not been getting along with their attorney. Plaintiffs, however, were aware that there were problems as early as January 2005, which was the same time they were agreeing to the new dates as set forth above. Defendants, however, have not known of these problems until now and have been diligently proceeding with this action pursuant to the mutually agreed upon stipulation. Defendants have taken the Plaintiffs depositions, completed written discovery and have prepared a motion for summary judgment. Any stay of these proceedings will severely prejudice Defendants who have been moving forward with this action to the best of their ability. In fact, Plaintiffs have not given any reasons as to why a stay is necessary this late in the litigation. More troubling, however, is the fact that Plaintiffs have not indicated for how long they wish the stay to last. For these reasons Defendants respectfully request that a stay not be granted and that this case be allowed to proceed in a timely

| 1 | manner, at least for purposes of a hearing on the Motion for Summary Judgment. If the Court | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | however, sees fit to grant a continuance, Defendants request that it be of a fairly short duration, | | |
| 3 | such that their motion for summary judgment can be heard, and hopefully the matter concluded. | | |
| 4 | Dated: April 5, 2005 | Respectfully submitted, | |
| 5 | | MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | By:/s/ Jennifer C. Addams | |
| 8 | | Attorneys for Defendant's CITY OF FAIRFIELD, | |
| 9 | | POLICE CHIEF WILLIAM GRES HAM, POLICE OFFICERS MARK SCHRAER, CHAT TIGERT | |
| 11 | | AND STEVE TROJANOWSKI, JR. | |
| 12 | 741129_1 | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | | | |